

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Claims 8, 9 and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 10-13 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paromtchik et al. (US 2002/0027652) (hereinafter "Paromtchik") in view of Bartsch et al. (US 6,459,955) (hereinafter "Bartsch").

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7-9

Amended claim 1 recites: "...the optical device receives a teaching position pointed to by the laser pointer and the controller controls the mobile robot to enter a specified area and to clean the area immediately after the optical device receives the teaching position without performing a compensating process." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claims 8 and 9, and in paragraph [0047] of the specification. The Office Action relies on a combination of Paromtchik and Bartsch to show this feature of claim 1. Bartsch is relied on to show a cleaning robot, which is shown in Bartsch. Paromtchik is relied on to show the control features of the robot, however, and it is respectfully submitted that Paromtchik does not discuss the technical feature of claim 1 where the controller controls the mobile robot to enter a specified area and to clean the area immediately after the optical device receives the teaching position without performing a compensating process. In Paromtchik, as discussed in paragraph [0109], when target positions indicated could not be detected then a failure analysis is performed to determine the reason why the detection could not be made and its compensation, for example, by means of setting target positions closer to the mobile robots 12-1, . . . , 12-i, . . . , and 12-n. In contrast to Paromtchik, the robot system of claim 1 makes possible immediate operation teaching without a compensating process. This technical feature of claim 1 reduces cost and further provides for easy and safe operation.

Claims 8 and 9 have been cancelled. Claims 3, 5 and 7 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 10-14

Amended claim 10 recites: "...wherein a plurality of reflecting traces corresponding to a plurality of command patterns are combined and stored as a single command pattern in the memory." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 14. The Office Action does not specify any particular portion of Paromtchik or Bartsch to show this feature of claim and instead notes that this feature, along with the technical features recited in claims 11-13, are obvious because they would enhance the robot's navigation system and reduce errors.

It is respectfully requested that references be provided to show the technical feature of claim 10 where a plurality of reflecting traces corresponding to a plurality of command patterns are combined and stored as a single command pattern in the memory. As noted in the Office Action, this feature of claim 10 reduces error while at the same time reducing cost and providing for more simplified operation. However, it is respectfully submitted that this feature is not obvious and patentably distinguishes over the relied upon prior art.

Claim 14 has been cancelled. Claims 11-13 depend on claim 10 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Further, claims 11-13 recite technical features not discussed in either Paromtchik or Bartsch. For example, claim 11 recites that when the reflecting trace is not in accordance with the command pattern and draws a line segment, the mobile robot is controlled to move along the line segment. This technical feature provides that when the reflecting trace is not in accordance with the command pattern, the mobile robot is controlled according to the commands based on patterns of the reflecting trace so that cleaning may be immediately performed without waiting for a compensating operation.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 14, 2007

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501